

Am,



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/503,040	02/11/2000	Rajiv Laroia	12-4-1-1	6040

7590

04/24/2003

Ryan & Mason LLP
90 Forest Avenue
Locust Valley, NY 11560

EXAMINER

STEVENS, ROBERTA A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2665

4

DATE MAILED: 04/24/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/503,040

Applicant(s)

LAROIA ET AL.

Examiner

Roberta A Stevens

Art Unit

2665

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 February 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-35 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) ✓
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1, 2, 6-8, 20, 25-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kinnunen (U.S. 6144656).

3. Regarding claims 1, 2, 6-8, 20, 25 and 26, Kinnunen teaches (abstract, columns 5-7 and figure 1) an apparatus and method of uplink communication between a mobile station of a wireless communication system, comprising: transmitting at least one of an uplink access signal and an uplink timing synchronization signal from the mobile station to the base station in a particular one of a set of recurring intervals in which regular uplink data transmission format least one additional mobile station to the base station is at least partially suspended.

4. Regarding claims 27 and 31-33, Kinnunen teaches (figure 1) an apparatus and method for use in a wireless communications system, comprising a mobile station uplink access and synchronization system operative to transmit at least one of an uplink access signal and an uplink timing synchronization signal to a base station of the system in a particular one of a set of recurring intervals in which regular uplink data transmission from at least one additional mobile station to the base station is at least partially suspended.

5. Regarding claims 28-30 and 34, Kinnunen teaches (figure 1) an apparatus and method for

Art Unit: 2665

uplink communication between a mobile station and a base station of a wireless communication system, comprising receiving in the base station at least one of an uplink access signal and an uplink timing synchronization signal transmitted from the mobile station in a particular one of a set of recurring intervals in which regular uplink data transmission from at least one additional mobile station to the base station is at least partially suspended.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 9, 10, 13, 16, 17-19 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kinnunen.

8. Regarding claims 9, 10, 13, 16, 17-19, as mentioned above Kinnunen teaches all of the limitations of claim 1. While Kinnunen does teach (figure 5) mobile station requesting and gaining access to the network, Kinnunen does not teach detecting the mobile stations use of the same access code and determining the time between subsequent access attempts. However these are not novel limitations and would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art to adapt to Kinnunen's system as a matter of design choice to make the system more efficient in data transmission.

9. Claims 5, 15 and 22-24 objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Art Unit: 2665

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Falco (U.S. 6493539 B1), Willars (U.S. 6449290 B1), Du (U.S. 6181947 B1), St-Pierre (U.S. 5883888), Oksala (U.S. 6477151 B1) and Dam (U.S. 6223040 B1) are cited to show the state of the art.

11. Any inquiry concerning the communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Roberta Stevens whose telephone number is (703) 308-6607. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 9:00 am to 5:30 p.m.

12. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor can be reached on (703) 308-6602.

13. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

14. **Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to: (703) 872-9314

For informal draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT"

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive,
Arlington, VA. Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Roberta A. Stevens
Patent Examiner
04-18-03



**ALPUS H. HSU
PRIMARY EXAMINER**